arXiv:1605.06139v1 [math.CO] 19 May 2016

DISPLAYING TANGLES AND NON-SEQUENTIAL SEPARATIONS

BEN CLARK

Abstract. We show that, for any graph or matroid, there is a tree that simultaneously distinguishes its maximal tangles, and, for each maximal tangle $\mathcal{T}$ that satisfies an additional robustness condition, displays all of the non-trivial separations relative to $\mathcal{T}$, up to a natural equivalence.

1. Introduction

Tangles provide a means of locating the highly-connected pieces of a graph, matroid or, more generally, a connectivity system. Roughly speaking, a tangle of order k does this by choosing a small side of each separation of order strictly less than k in a compatible way. We say that (X, Y) is a *distinguishing separation* for a pair of tangles if they choose different small sides of (X, Y). Tangles were introduced by Robertson and Seymour in [5], where they showed each graph G has a tree decomposition that displays a minimum-order distinguishing separation for each pair of maximal tangles of G. This result was a key ingredient in their graph minors project, and the analogous result for connectivity systems, and hence matroids, was proved by Geelen, Gerards, and Whittle in [3].

Consider a tangle $\mathcal{T}$ of order k in a graph or matroid, and suppose that (X, Y) is a k-separation such that neither X nor Y is contained in a small side of $\mathcal{T}$. We can think of (X, Y) as a minimum-order separation that gives information about the structure of the highly-connected piece located by $\mathcal{T}$. Given such a separation (X, Y), we say X is *sequential* with respect to $\mathcal{T}$ if there is an ordered partition $(Z_1, \ldots, Z_n)$ of X such that, for each $i \in \{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$, the set Z_i is contained in a small side of $\mathcal{T}$ and $Y \cup Z_1 \cup \cdots \cup Z_i$ is k-separating. We say that (X, Y) is *non-sequential* with respect to $\mathcal{T}$ if neither X nor Y is sequential with respect to $\mathcal{T}$. Clark and Whittle [2] showed that, if $\mathcal{T}$ satisfies an additional necessary robustness condition, then, up to a natural equivalence, the k-separations that are non-sequential relative to $\mathcal{T}$ can be displayed in a tree-like way. This extended earlier results on the structure of 3-separations in 3-connected matroids [4] and the structure of 4-separations in 4-connected matroids [1].

In [2], the authors asked if it were possible to associate a tree with a graph or matroid that simultaneously displays a distinguishing separation for each pair of maximal tangles, and, for each maximal tangle, displays a representative of each non-sequential separation relative to the tangle in a tree-like way. The main result of this paper, Theorem 2.8, shows that this is indeed possible.

Date: May 23, 2016.

In Section 2, we provide the necessary preliminaries and give a precise statement of the main theorem. In Section 3, we show that we can work with a connectivity system that allows us to handle the problem of crossing separations. Finally, in Section 4, we prove the main theorem.

2. Preliminaries and the main theorem

Let λ be an integer-valued function on the subsets of a finite set E. We call λ *symmetric* if $\lambda(X) = \lambda(E-X)$ for all $X \subseteq E$. We call λ *submodular* if $\lambda(X)+\lambda(Y) \geq \lambda(X \cup Y)+\lambda(X \cap Y)$ for all $X, Y \subseteq E$. If λ is integer-valued, symmetric, and submodular, then λ is called a *connectivity function* on E. If E is a finite set and λ is a connectivity function on E, then the pair (E, λ) is a *connectivity system*.

The results in this paper are stated for connectivity systems. Of course, we are primarily interested in connectivity systems because they arise naturally from matroids and graphs. Let M be a matroid on ground set E with rank function r. For $X \subseteq E$, we let $\lambda_M(X) = r(X) + r(E - X) - r(M) + 1$. It is straightforward to prove that (E, λ_M) is a connectivity system. Let G be a graph with edge set E. For $X \subseteq E$, we let $\lambda_G(X)$ denote the number of vertices of G that are incident with both an edge of X and an edge of $E - X$. It is also straightforward to prove that (E, λ_G) is a connectivity system. Thus for the results in this paper, we immediately obtain corollaries for matroids and graphs.

Let $K = (E, \lambda)$ be a connectivity system, and let k be a positive integer. A partition $(X, E - X)$ of E is called a *k-separation* of K if $\lambda(X) \leq k$. A subset X of E is said to be *k-separating* in λ if $\lambda(X) \leq k$. Two separations (A, B) and (C, D) *cross* if all the intersections $A \cap C$, $A \cap D$, $B \cap C$, and $B \cap D$ are non-empty. The fact that separations can cross is the main obstacle to overcome to obtain this main result.

We now build towards a precise statement of the main result of [3], which is essential in the proof of the main theorem of this paper.

A *tangle of order k* in $K = (E, \lambda)$ is a collection $\mathcal{T}$ of subsets of E such that the following properties hold:

(T1) $\lambda(A) < k$ for all $A \in \mathcal{T}$.
(T2) If $(A, E - A)$ is a $(k-1)$-separation, then $\mathcal{T}$ contains A or $E - A$.
(T3) If $A, B, C \in \mathcal{T}$, then $A \cup B \cup C \neq E$.
(T4) $E - \{e\} \notin \mathcal{T}$ for each $e \in E$.

Let $k \geq 1$ be an integer, and let $\mathcal{T}$ be a tangle of order k in a connectivity system $K = (E, \lambda)$. Now let $j \leq k$, and let $\mathcal{T}|_j \subseteq \mathcal{T}$ be the set of $A \in \mathcal{T}$ such that $\lambda(A) \leq j$.

Lemma 2.1. [3, Lemma 4.1] *$\mathcal{T}|_j$ is a tangle of order j in (E, λ).*

We say that $\mathcal{T}|_j$ is the *truncation* of $\mathcal{T}$ to order j. If $\mathcal{T}_1$ and $\mathcal{T}_2$ are tangles, neither of which is a truncation of the other, then there is some *distinguishing separation* (X_1, X_2) with $X_1 \in \mathcal{T}_1$ and $X_2 \in \mathcal{T}_2$.

A *tree-decomposition* of E is a tree T with $V(T) = \{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$ and a partition $(P_1, P_2, \ldots, P_n)$ of E (where $P_1, P_2, \ldots, P_n$ are called *bags*, and may be empty). Let e be an edge of T, and let T_1 and T_2 be the components of $T \backslash e$. The separation $(\bigcup_{i \in V(T_1)} P_i, \bigcup_{i \in V(T_2)} P_i)$ of K is said to be *displayed*

by e. A separation of K is *displayed by* T if it is displayed by some edge of T. We can now state the main result of [3].

Theorem 2.2. [3, Theorem 9.1] *Let $K = (E, \lambda)$ be a connectivity system, and let $\mathcal{T}_1, \dots \mathcal{T}_n$ be tangles in K, none of which is a truncation of another. Then there exists a tree-decomposition T of λ such that $V(T) = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ and such that the following hold:*

(a) For each $i \in V(T)$ and $e \in E(T)$ if T' is the component of $T \backslash e$ containing i, then the union of those bags that label vertices of T' is not a member of $\mathcal{T}_i$.

(b) For each pair of distinct vertices i and j of T, there exists a minimum-order distinguishing separation for $\mathcal{T}_i$ and $\mathcal{T}_j$ that is displayed by T.

We now introduce the terminology necessary to state the main result of [2]. In what follows, unless explicitly stated otherwise, we let $K = (E, \lambda)$ be a connectivity system, and let $\mathcal{T}$ be a tangle of order k in K.

A subset X of E is *$\mathcal{T}$-strong* if it is not contained in a member of $\mathcal{T}$; otherwise X is *$\mathcal{T}$-weak*. It is easy to see that supersets of $\mathcal{T}$-strong sets are $\mathcal{T}$-strong, and that subsets of $\mathcal{T}$-weak sets are $\mathcal{T}$-weak. A partition $(X_1, \dots, X_n)$ of E is *$\mathcal{T}$-strong* if X_i is a $\mathcal{T}$-strong set for all $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$. In particular, a k-separation $(X, E - X)$ of λ is *$\mathcal{T}$-strong* if both X and $E - X$ are $\mathcal{T}$-strong sets. We note that if a partition $\{X, E - X\}$ of E is $\mathcal{T}$-strong, then neither X nor $E - X$ is a member of $\mathcal{T}$, so $\lambda(X) \geq k$ by (T2). Thus a $\mathcal{T}$-strong k-separation $(X, E - X)$ is exact.

A $\mathcal{T}$-strong k-separating set X is *fully closed with respect to $\mathcal{T}$* if $X \cup Y$ is not k-separating for every non-empty $\mathcal{T}$-weak set $Y \subseteq E - X$. Let X be a $\mathcal{T}$-strong k-separating set. Then the intersection of all fully-closed k-separating sets that contain X, which we denote by $\mathrm{fcl}_{\mathcal{T}}(X)$, is called the *full closure of X with respect to $\mathcal{T}$*. We use the full closure with respect to $\mathcal{T}$ to define equivalence of k-separations. Let (X, Y) and (X', Y') be $\mathcal{T}$-strong k-separations of λ. Then (X, Y) is *$\mathcal{T}$-equivalent* to (X', Y') if $\{\mathrm{fcl}_{\mathcal{T}}(X), \mathrm{fcl}_{\mathcal{T}}(Y)\} = \{\mathrm{fcl}_{\mathcal{T}}(X'), \mathrm{fcl}_{\mathcal{T}}(Y')\}$. We say that $E - X$ is *$\mathcal{T}$-sequential* if $\mathrm{fcl}_{\mathcal{T}}(X) = E$. A k-separation (X, Y) is *$\mathcal{T}$-sequential* if X or Y is a $\mathcal{T}$-sequential k-separating set; otherwise (X, Y) is *non-sequential with respect to $\mathcal{T}$*. A *partial k-sequence for X* is a sequence $(X_i)_{i=1}^m$ of pairwise disjoint, non-empty $\mathcal{T}$-weak subsets of $E - X$ such that $X \cup (\bigcup_{i=1}^j X_i)$ is k-separating for all $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, m\}$. A partial k-sequence $(X_i)_{i=1}^m$ for X is said to be *maximal* if $X \cup (\bigcup_{i=1}^m X_i)$ is inclusion-wise maximal. A maximal partial k-sequence is simply called a *k-sequence*. We use the following characterisation full closure with respect to $\mathcal{T}$.

Lemma 2.3. [2, Lemma 3.6] *Let $\mathcal{T}$ be a tangle of order k in a connectivity system (E, λ). Let X be a $\mathcal{T}$-strong k-separating set, and let $(X_i)_{i=1}^m$ be a partial k-sequence for X. Then $\mathrm{fcl}_{\mathcal{T}}(X) = X \cup (\bigcup_{i=1}^m X_i)$ if and only if $(X_i)_{i=1}^m$ is a k-sequence.*

We use the following lemmas on $\mathcal{T}$-equivalence.

Lemma 2.4. [2, Lemma 3.7] *Let $\mathcal{T}$ be a tangle of order k in a connectivity system K, and let (A, B) and (C, D) be two k-separations of K that are*

non-sequential with respect to $\mathcal{T}$*. Then* (A, B) *is* $\mathcal{T}$*-equivalent to* (C, D) *if and only if either* $\mathrm{fcl}_{\mathcal{T}}(A) = \mathrm{fcl}_{\mathcal{T}}(C)$ *or* $\mathrm{fcl}_{\mathcal{T}}(A) = \mathrm{fcl}_{\mathcal{T}}(D)$*.*

Lemma 2.5. [2, Lemma 3.8] *Let* $\mathcal{T}$ *be a tangle of order* k *in* K*. Let* (R, G) *be a* k*-separation of* K *that is non-sequential with respect to* $\mathcal{T}$*, and let* $A \subseteq G$ *be a non-empty* $\mathcal{T}$*-weak set. If* $R \cup A$ *is a* k*-separating set, then* (R, G) *is* $\mathcal{T}$*-equivalent to* $(R \cup A, G - A)$*.*

Lemma 2.6. [2, Corollary 3.5] *Let* $\mathcal{T}$ *be a tangle of order* k *in a connectivity system* (E, λ)*, and let* X *be a* $\mathcal{T}$*-strong* k*-separating set. If* $(X_i)_{i=1}^m$ *is a partial* k*-sequence for* X*, then* $\mathrm{fcl}_{\mathcal{T}}(X \cup (\bigcup_{i=1}^m X_i)) = \mathrm{fcl}_{\mathcal{T}}(X)$*.*

In order to handle separations that cross, we need the following notion. A $\mathcal{T}$-strong partition $(P_1, \ldots, P_n)$ of E is a *k-flower* in $\mathcal{T}$ with *petals* $P_1, \ldots, P_n$ if, for all i, both P_i and $P_i \cup P_{i+1}$ are k-separating sets, where all subscripts are interpreted modulo n. A k-separating set X or k-separation $(X, E - X)$ is said to be *displayed* by Φ if X is a union of petals of Φ.

Let π be a partition of E (note that we allow members of π to be empty.) Let T be a tree such that every member of π labels a vertex of T (some vertices may be unlabelled and no vertex is multiply labelled.) We say that T is a *π-labelled tree*. The vertices of T labelled by the members of π are called *bag vertices*, and the members of π are called *bags*. Let T' be a subtree of T. The union of those bags that label vertices of T' is the subset of E *displayed* by T'. Let e be an edge of T. The *partition of E displayed by e* is the partition displayed by the connected components of $T \backslash e$. Let v be a vertex of T that is not a bag vertex. Then the *partition of E displayed by v* is the partition displayed by the connected components of $T - v$. The edges incident with v are in natural one-to-one correspondence with the connected components of $T - v$, and hence with the members of the partition of E displayed by v. If a cyclic ordering is imposed on the edges incident with v, then we cyclically order the members of the partition of E displayed by v in the corresponding order. We say that v is a *k-flower vertex for $\mathcal{T}$* if the partition $(P_1, \ldots, P_n)$ of E displayed by v, in the cyclic order corresponding to the cyclic order on the edges incident with v, is a k-flower in $\mathcal{T}$. The k-separations displayed by the k-flower corresponding to a k-flower vertex are called the k-separations *displayed by v*. A k-separation is *displayed* by T if it is displayed by an edge or a k-flower vertex of T.

We say that $\mathcal{T}$ is a *robust tangle of order k* in $K = (E, \lambda)$ if $\mathcal{T}$ is a tangle of order k that satisfies:

(RT3) If $A_1, A_2, \ldots, A_8 \in \mathcal{T}$, then $A_1 \cup A_2 \cup \cdots \cup A_8 \neq E$.

The following result is the main theorem of [2].

Theorem 2.7. [2, Theorem 7.1] *Let* $\mathcal{T}$ *be a robust tangle of order* k *in a connectivity system* $K = (E, \lambda)$*. There is a* π*-labelled tree such that every* k*-separation of* K *that is non-sequential with respect to* $\mathcal{T}$ *is* $\mathcal{T}$*-equivalent to some* k*-separation displayed by* T*.*

We can now state the main theorem of this paper.

Theorem 2.8. *Let* $K = (E, \lambda)$ *be a connectivity system, and let* $\mathcal{T}_1, \ldots \mathcal{T}_n$ *be tangles in* K*, none of which is a truncation of another. Then there is a* π*-labelled tree* T *such that the following hold.*

(i) *For all $i, j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ with $i \neq j$, there is a minimum-order distinguishing separation for $\mathcal{T}_i$ and $\mathcal{T}_j$ that is displayed by some edge of T; and*
(ii) *For all $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, if $\mathcal{T}_i$ is a robust tangle of order k and (X, Y) is a k-separation of K that is non-sequential with respect to $\mathcal{T}_i$, then there is some k-separation (X', Y') of K displayed by T that is $\mathcal{T}_i$-equivalent to (X, Y).*

3. New tangles from old

For tangles $\mathcal{T}_1, \dots \mathcal{T}_n$ in a connectivity system K, none of which is a truncation of another, crossing separations are the main obstacle to combining the separations displayed by the tree of Theorem 2.2 and the tree of Theorem 2.7 into a single tree. To overcome this, we will show that for each robust tangle $\mathcal{T}_i$ we can construct the tree of Theorem 2.7 for $\mathcal{T}_i$ in such a way that the distinguishing separations displayed by the tree of Theorem 2.2 conform. We do this by moving to a new connectivity system and tangle, which we describe in this section.

The following construction is found in [3]. Let $K = (E, \lambda)$ be a connectivity system and let $X \subseteq E$. Let $K \circ X = ((E - X) \cup \{x\}, \lambda')$, where for each $A \subseteq E - X$ we let $\lambda'(A) = \lambda(A)$ and $\lambda'(A \cup \{x\}) = \lambda(A \cup X)$.

Lemma 3.1. [3, Lemma 4.2.] *If K is a connectivity system and $X \subseteq E$, then $K \circ X$ is a connectivity system.*

Let X be a subset of E, and let $\pi = (X_1, \dots, X_n)$ be a partition of X. By repeated application of Lemma 3.1, we deduce that $K \circ \pi := ((E - X) \cup \{x_1, \dots, x_n\}, \lambda_\pi)$ is a connectivity system, where for each $A \subseteq E - X$ and $I \subseteq \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ we let $\lambda_\pi(A \cup (\bigcup_{i \in I} x_i)) = \lambda(A \cup (\bigcup_{i \in I} X_i))$.

We can also obtain a robust tangle in $K \circ X$ from a robust tangle in K as follows. We omit the routine verification of the robust tangle axioms.

Lemma 3.2. *Let $\mathcal{T}$ be a robust tangle of order k in a connectivity system K and let X be in $\mathcal{T}$. Let $\mathcal{T}'$ be the set of subsets of $(E - X) \cup \{x\}$ such that, for all $A \subseteq (E - X)$, we have $A \in \mathcal{T}'$ if and only if $A \in \mathcal{T}$; and $A \cup \{x\} \in \mathcal{T}'$ if and only if $A \cup X \in \mathcal{T}$. Then $\mathcal{T}'$ is a robust tangle of order k in $K \circ X$.*

In particular, if $\mathcal{T}$ is a robust tangle of order k in a connectivity system $K = (E, \lambda)$, and $\pi = (X_1, \dots, X_n)$ is a partition of a subset X of E such that $X_i \in \mathcal{T}$ for all $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$, then, by repeated application of Lemma 3.2, we obtain a robust tangle $\mathcal{T}_\pi$ of order k in $K \circ \pi$. For any $A \subseteq E - X$ and $I \subseteq \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$, we have $A \cup (\bigcup_{i \in I} x_i) \in \mathcal{T}_\pi$ if and only if $A \cup (\bigcup_{i \in I} X_i) \in \mathcal{T}$.

Let $K = (E, \lambda)$ be a connectivity system, let $\mathcal{T}$ be a robust tangle of order k in K, and let B be a subset of E. A partition $\pi = (B_1, \dots, B_n)$ of B is called a *bag partition of B with respect to $\mathcal{T}$* if

(i) $B_1, \dots, B_n \in \mathcal{T}$; and
(ii) For each $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$, if (X, Y) is a partition of B_i, then $\lambda(X) \geq \lambda(B_i)$ or $\lambda(Y) \geq \lambda(B_i)$.

The sets $B_1, \dots, B_n$ are called *bags* of π. By Lemma 3.2 there is a robust tangle $\mathcal{T}_\pi$ of order k in $K \circ \pi$ obtained from $\mathcal{T}$; we call $\mathcal{T}_\pi$ the tangle in $K \circ \pi$

induced by $\mathcal{T}$. For the remainder of this section we look at k-separations in K and $K \circ \pi$, and we show that $\mathcal{T}$- and $\mathcal{T}_\pi$-equivalence are compatible.

Let $B \subseteq E$, and let $(B_1, \dots, B_n)$ be a bag partition for B with respect to $\mathcal{T}$, and suppose that (R, G) is a k-separation that does not cross B_i for all $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$. Then $(R, G) = (R' \cup (\bigcup_{i \in I} B_i), G' \cup (\bigcup_{i \in (\{1,2,\dots,n\} - I)} B_i))$ for some partition (R', G') of $E - B$ and some $I \subseteq \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$. It follows immediately from the definition of $K \circ \pi$ that the corresponding partition $(R' \cup (\bigcup_{i \in I} b_i), G' \cup (\bigcup_{i \in (\{1,2,\dots,n\} - I)} b_i))$ of $(E - B) \cup \{b_1, \dots, b_n\}$ is a k-separation of $K \circ \pi$. We say that the k-separation $(R' \cup (\bigcup_{i \in I} b_i), G' \cup (\bigcup_{i \in (\{1,2,\dots,n\} - I)} b_i))$ of $K \circ \pi$ is *induced* by the k-separation (R, G) of K. Moreover, it follows immediately from the definition of the tangle $\mathcal{T}_\pi$ induced by $\mathcal{T}$ that (R, G) is $\mathcal{T}$-strong if and only if the induced k-separation $(R' \cup (\bigcup_{i \in I} b_i), G' \cup (\bigcup_{i \in (\{1,2,\dots,n\} - I)} b_i))$ is $\mathcal{T}_\pi$-strong. We next show that every $\mathcal{T}$-equivalence class of non-sequential k-separations contains a member that does not cross any bags of π.

Lemma 3.3. *Let $\mathcal{T}$ be a tangle of order k in a connectivity system $K = (E, \lambda)$, and let $\pi = (B_1, \dots, B_n)$ be a bag partition for B with respect to $\mathcal{T}$. If (R, G) is a k-separation of K that is non-sequential with respect to $\mathcal{T}$, then (R, G) is $\mathcal{T}$-equivalent to a k-separation (R', G') that does not cross B_i for any $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$.*

Proof. Assume that (R, G) crosses the minimum number of bags amongst all $\mathcal{T}$-equivalent k-separations. We may assume, up to relabelling the bags, that (R, G) crosses B_1. By definition of the bag partition π we may assume that $\lambda(R \cap B_1) \geq \lambda(B_1)$. Then $R \cup B_1$ is k-separating by submodularity, so $(R \cup B_1, G - B_1)$ is a k-separation that is $\mathcal{T}$-equivalent to (R, G) by Lemma 2.5, and $(R \cup B_1, G - B_1)$ crosses fewer bags than (R, G), a contradiction. □

For k-separations that are non-sequential with respect to $\mathcal{T}$, the induced k-separations are also non-sequential with respect to the induced tangle $\mathcal{T}_\pi$, which we now show.

Lemma 3.4. *Let $\mathcal{T}$ be a tangle of order k in a connectivity system $K = (E, \lambda)$, and let $\pi = (B_1, \dots, B_n)$ be a bag partition for B with respect to $\mathcal{T}$. If (R, G) is a k-separation of K that is non-sequential with respect to $\mathcal{T}$ and does not cross B_i for any $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$, then the induced k-separation (R_π, G_π) of $K \circ \pi$ is non-sequential with respect to $\mathcal{T}_\pi$.*

Proof. Since (R, G) does not cross any of the B_i, we know that $(R, G) = (R' \cup (\bigcup_{i \in I} B_i), G' \cup (\bigcup_{i \in (\{1,2,\dots,n\} - I)} B_i))$ for some partition (R', G') of $E - B$ and some subset I of $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$. Hence the induced k-separation of $K \circ \pi$ is $(R_\pi, G_\pi) = (R' \cup (\bigcup_{i \in I} b_i), G' \cup (\bigcup_{i \in (\{1,2,\dots,n\} - I)} b_i))$. Assume that (R_π, G_π) is $\mathcal{T}_\pi$-sequential. Then by Lemma 2.3, up to switching R_π and G_π, there is a k-sequence $(X_i)_{i=1}^m$ for R_π such that $R_\pi \cup (\bigcup_{i=1}^m X_i) = (E - B) \cup \{b_1, \dots, b_n\}$. Now, for each $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, m\}$, we have $X_i = X_i' \cup (\bigcup_{i \in J} b_i)$ for some $X_i' \subseteq G'$ and $J \subseteq (\{1, 2, \dots, n\} - I)$. Then, by definition of $K \circ \pi$ and $\mathcal{T}_\pi$, it follows that there is a k-sequence $(Y_i)_{i=1}^m$ for R where $Y_i = X_i' \cup (\bigcup_{i \in J} B_i)$ for each $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, m\}$, and $R \cup (\bigcup_{i=1}^m Y_i) = E$, so (R, G) is $\mathcal{T}$-sequential by Lemma 2.3, a contradiction. □

To conclude this section, we show that $\mathcal{T}$-equivalence can be recovered from $\mathcal{T}_\pi$-equivalence.

Lemma 3.5. *Let $\mathcal{T}$ be a tangle of order k in a connectivity system $K = (E, \lambda)$, and let $\pi = (B_1, \dots, B_n)$ be a bag partition for B with respect to $\mathcal{T}$. Let (R, G) be a k-separation of K that is non-sequential with respect to $\mathcal{T}$ and does not cross B_i for all $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$, and let (R_π, G_π) be the induced k-separation of $K \circ \pi$. If (R_π, G_π) is $\mathcal{T}_\pi$-equivalent to (R'_π, G'_π), then (R, G) is $\mathcal{T}$-equivalent to the k-separation (R', G') that induces (R'_π, G'_π).*

Proof. We may assume, up to switching R'_π and G'_π, that $\mathrm{fcl}_{\mathcal{T}_\pi}(R_\pi) = \mathrm{fcl}_{\mathcal{T}_\pi}(R'_\pi)$. Let $(Y_i)_{i=1}^m$ be a k-sequence for R_π and $(Z_i)_{i=1}^p$ be a k-sequence for R'_π. Then, for each $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, m\}$ and $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, p\}$, we have $Y_i = Y'_i \cup (\bigcup_{i \in I} b_i)$ and $Z_j = Z'_j \cup (\bigcup_{j \in J} b_j)$ for some subsets Y'_i and Z'_j of $E - B$ and some $I, J \subseteq \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$. For each $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, m\}$ and $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, p\}$, let $Y''_i = Y'_i \cup (\bigcup_{i \in I} B_i)$ and let $Z''_j = Z'_j \cup (\bigcup_{j \in J} B_j)$. Then $(Y''_i)_{i=1}^m$ is a partial k-sequence for R, $(Z''_i)_{i=1}^p$ is a partial k-sequence for R', and $R \cup (\bigcup_{i \in \{1,2,\dots,m\}} Y''_i)$ is equal to $R' \cup (\bigcup_{i \in \{1,2,\dots,p\}} Z''_i)$ since $\mathrm{fcl}_{\mathcal{T}_\pi}(R_\pi) = \mathrm{fcl}_{\mathcal{T}_\pi}(R'_\pi)$, so it follows from Lemma 2.6 that $\mathrm{fcl}_{\mathcal{T}}(R) = \mathrm{fcl}_{\mathcal{T}}(R')$. Hence (R, G) is $\mathcal{T}$-equivalent to the k-separation (R', G') by Lemma 2.4. □

4. The main theorem

The next lemma is used to show that minimum-order distinguishing separations give rise to bag partitions.

Lemma 4.1. *Let $\mathcal{T}_1$ and $\mathcal{T}_2$ be tangles in K, and let (X_1, X_2) be a minimum-order distinguishing separation for $\mathcal{T}_1$ and $\mathcal{T}_2$ with $X_1 \in \mathcal{T}_1$ and $X_2 \in \mathcal{T}_2$. If (R, G) is a partition of X_2, then $\lambda(R) \geq \lambda(X_2)$ or $\lambda(R) \geq \lambda(X_2)$.*

Proof. Assume that $\lambda(R) < \lambda(X_2)$ and $\lambda(G) < \lambda(X_2)$. Then, since (X_1, X_2) is a minimum-order distinguishing separation for $\mathcal{T}_1$ and $\mathcal{T}_2$, neither $(R, E - R)$ nor $(G, E - G)$ is a distinguishing separation for $\mathcal{T}_1$ and $\mathcal{T}_2$. Now G and R cannot belong to $\mathcal{T}_1$ and $\mathcal{T}_2$ because $R \cup G \cup X_1 = E$, contradicting (T3) for $\mathcal{T}_1$. Thus, up to relabelling R and G, we may assume that $E - R$ belongs to $\mathcal{T}_1$ and $\mathcal{T}_2$. But $(E - R) \cup X_2 = E$, contradicting (T3) for $\mathcal{T}_2$. □

We now prove the main theorem, which we restate for convenience.

Theorem 4.2. *Let $K = (E, \lambda)$ be a connectivity system, and let $\mathcal{T}_1, \dots \mathcal{T}_n$ be tangles in K, none of which is a truncation of another. Then there is a partition π of E, and a π-labelled tree T such that the following hold.*

- *(i) For all $i, j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ with $i \neq j$, there is a minimum-order distinguishing separation for $\mathcal{T}_i$ and $\mathcal{T}_j$ that is displayed by some edge of T; and*
- *(ii) For all $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, if $\mathcal{T}_i$ is a robust tangle of order k and (X, Y) is a k-separation of K that is non-sequential with respect to $\mathcal{T}_i$, then there is some k-separation (X', Y') of K displayed by T that is $\mathcal{T}_i$-equivalent to (X, Y).*

Proof. By Theorem 2.2 there is a tree T on the vertex set $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ with the following properties.

(a) For each $i \in V(T)$ and $e \in E(T)$ if T' is the component of $T\backslash e$ containing i, then the union of those bags that label vertices of T' is not a member of $\mathcal{T}_i$.
(b) For each pair of distinct vertices i and j of T, there exists a minimum-order distinguishing separation for $\mathcal{T}_i$ and $\mathcal{T}_j$ that is displayed by T.

Let $i \in \{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$, and let $N(i)$ be the set of vertices of T that are adjacent to i.

4.2.1. *If $j \in N(i)$, then the separation displayed by the edge ij of T is a minimum-order distinguishing separation for $\mathcal{T}_i$ and $\mathcal{T}_j$.*

Subproof. For each edge $e \in E(T) - \{ij\}$ the vertices i and j are in the same component of $T\backslash e$, so, by Theorem 2.2 (a), the separation (R, G) displayed by ij is the only separation displayed by T that distinguishes $\mathcal{T}_i$ and $\mathcal{T}_j$. Hence, by Theorem 2.2 (b), the separation (R, G) is of minimum order. □

Let $\mathcal{T}_i \in \{\mathcal{T}_1, \ldots \mathcal{T}_n\}$. We associate a π_i-labelled tree with $\mathcal{T}_i$, where π_i is a partition of E. If $\mathcal{T}_i$ is not a robust tangle, then we let T_i be the tree with a single vertex labelled by E. Suppose that $\mathcal{T}_i$ is a robust tangle of order k. Let $B \subseteq E$ be the bag labelling i in the tree T and, for each $j \in N(i)$, let B_j be the set displayed by the component of $T\backslash ij$ containing j.

4.2.2. *$\pi'_i = \{B_j \mid j \in N(i)\}$ is a bag partition for $E - B$ with respect to $\mathcal{T}_i$.*

Subproof. It follows from Theorem 2.2 (a) and 4.2.1 that the members of π'_i belong to $\mathcal{T}_i$. By Lemma 4.1 and 4.2.1, for each $j \in N(i)$, if (X, Y) is a partition of B_j, then $\lambda(X) \geq \lambda(B_j)$ or $\lambda(Y) \geq \lambda(B_j)$. □

Let $\mathcal{T}_{\pi'_i}$ be the bag tangle of order k in $K \circ \pi'_i$ induced by $\mathcal{T}_i$. Then $\mathcal{T}_{\pi'_i}$ is a robust tangle of order k by Lemma 3.2. By Theorem 2.7, there is a maximal partial k-tree $T_{\pi'_i}$ for $\mathcal{T}_{\pi'_i}$. Let T_i be the π_i-labelled tree obtained from $T_{\pi'_i}$ by replacing b_j by B_j for all $j \in N(i)$.

4.2.3. *Every k-separation of K that is non-sequential with respect to $\mathcal{T}_i$ is $\mathcal{T}_i$-equivalent to some k-separation displayed by T_i.*

Subproof. Let (R, G) be a k-separation of K that is non-sequential with respect to $\mathcal{T}_i$. We may assume, by Lemma 3.3, that (R, G) does not cross any bag of π'_i. Then the k-separation $(R_{\pi'_i}, G_{\pi'_i})$ of $K \circ \pi'_i$ induced by (R, G) is non-sequential with respect to $\mathcal{T}_{\pi'_i}$ by Lemma 3.4. By Theorem 2.7, the k-separation $(R_{\pi'_i}, G_{\pi'_i})$ is $\mathcal{T}_{\pi'_i}$-equivalent to a k-separation $(R'_{\pi'_i}, G'_{\pi'_i})$ of $K \circ \pi'_i$ that is displayed by the tree $T_{\pi'_i}$. Then the k-separation (R', G') of K that induces $(R'_{\pi'_i}, G'_{\pi'_i})$ is displayed by the tree T_i, and (R', G') is $\mathcal{T}_i$-equivalent to (R, G) by Lemma 3.5. □

Now, for each tangle $\mathcal{T}_i$, there is a π_i-labelled tree T_i such that, if $\mathcal{T}_i$ is robust, then T_i displays, up to $\mathcal{T}_i$-equivalence, all of the separations that are non-sequential with respect to $\mathcal{T}_i$. Moreover, for each $j \in N(i)$, the set B_j displayed by the component of $T\backslash ij$ not containing i is contained some bag of π_i.

Consider the forest F with components $T_1, T_2, \ldots, T_n$. We construct a π-labelled tree τ from F by performing the following procedure for each edge

of T. For each edge ij of T and $k \in \{i, j\}$, let X_k be the set displayed by the component of $T \backslash ij$ that contains the vertex k. By the construction of T_i and T_j, there is some vertex v of T_i labelled by a bag B_v that contains X_j, and some vertex w of T_j labelled by a bag B_w that contains X_i. We join v and w by an edge, then relabel v by the bag $B_v - X_j$ and relabel w by the bag $B_w - X_i$. Let τ denote the resulting tree.

It follows from the construction that τ is a π-labelled tree. For each distinct $i, j \in \{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$, since there is some minimum-order distinguishing separation for $\mathcal{T}_i$ and $\mathcal{T}_j$ displayed by an edge of T, it follows from the construction that this separation is also displayed by an edge of τ, so (i) holds. Moreover, if $\mathcal{T}_i$ is a robust tangle of order k, then every k-separation of K that is non-sequential with respect to $\mathcal{T}_i$ is $\mathcal{T}_i$-equivalent to some k-separation displayed by T_i by 4.2.3, and by the construction this separation is displayed by τ. □

References

[1] Aikin, J., and Oxley, J. The structure of the 4-separations in 4-connected matroids. *Advances in Applied Mathematics 48*, 1 (2012), 1–24.

[2] Clark, B., and Whittle, G. Tangles, trees, and flowers. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B 103* (2013), 385–407.

[3] Geelen, J., Gerards, B., and Whittle, G. Tangles, tree-decompositions and grids in matroids. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B 99*, 4 (2009), 657–667.

[4] Oxley, J., Semple, C., and Whittle, G. The structure of the 3-separations of 3-connected matroids. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B 92*, 2 (2004), 257–293.

[5] Robertson, N., and Seymour, P. Graph minors. X. Obstructions to tree-decomposition. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B 52*, 2 (1991), 153–190.

Department of Mathematics, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, Louisiana, USA

E-mail address: bclark@lsu.edu